

Morphological Parallels between Klamath and Wintu

Scott DeLancey
University of Oregon

Of the Oregon languages which have been suggested as being affiliated with the California languages labelled Penutian, Klamath seems on geographical as well as general structural grounds to be the most promising place to look for evidence of Penutian relationship.^{1,2} This paper records a few suggestive points of morphological similarity between Klamath and Wintu, its nearest California Penutian neighbor.³ Wintu data not otherwise attributed are from Pitkin 1984; Klamath data not otherwise attributed are from Barker 1964.

We will consider comparisons between the two languages in several systems: the pronominal paradigms, a special category of "locative" words with an associated set of special postpositions, the nominalization paradigm in the verb system, and an associated marker of definiteness or referentiality. These data are not all equally compelling. We first present the very striking similarities in the pronouns, which are of a nature which cannot be due to chance. The similarities between the "locative" systems are less obvious, and the differences considerably greater; nevertheless the similarities are sufficient that they can contribute to a case for relationship. The possible similarities in the verb system are more subtle, and on their own would carry little conviction. They are worth considering in the context of the other morphological similarities, but in any case we will require some work on internal reconstruction of Klamath, and internal and comparative reconstruction of Wintuan, before these can be finally evaluated. The same is true of the *t* suffixes in the two languages which I will try to equate in the final section; although there are clearly intriguing similarities, they require a richer context both of comparative Klamath-Wintuan and of syntactic analysis of Klamath and of Wintuan languages before their significance can be finally determined.

I. Klamath and Wintu pronouns⁴

The most striking, and most compelling, parallel which I have observed between the two languages is in the pronominal paradigms. The two languages share not only the same pronominal roots, but also contrastive suffixes, object markers, and plural stem formations. The comparable singular and plural forms are as follows (note that Barker's /b/ represents unaspirated [p], contrasting with aspirated /p/ = [p^h], and Pitkin's /p/ is also [p], contrasting with aspirated /ph/ = [p^h]):

| | <u>SUBJECT</u> | <u>CONTRASTIVE</u> | <u>OBJECT</u> | <u>GENITIVE</u> |
|-------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 1 sg. | ni | niyo | nis | net(o) |
| 1 pl. | | nele-/nite- | | nele:n |
| 2 sg. | mi | miyo | mis | mat(o) |
| 2 pl. | | male-/mite- | | male:n |
| 3 sg. | pi | piyo | put | putun |
| 3 pl. | | pite-/puba: | | puba:n- |

WINTU PRONOMINAL PARADIGM (SIMPLIFIED)

| | <u>SUBJECT</u> | <u>CONTRASTIVE</u> | <u>OBJECT</u> | <u>GENITIVE</u> |
|-------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 1 sg. | ni | no: | nis/no:s | gew |
| 1 pl. | na:d | | na:l's/na:ds | na:l'm |
| 2 sg. | ?i | | mis | mi |
| 2 pl. | ?a:d | | ma:l's/ma:ds | ma:l'm |
| 3 sg. | | bi | bas/bo:s/ba | mna |
| 3 pl. | sa | ba:d | mna:ls | mna:l'm |

KLAMATH PRONOMINAL PARADIGM

The Klamath and Wintu 3rd person plural forms are more parallel than they appear; we can identify the /m/ in the Klamath forms with the {b} element in the other 3rd person forms, and hence with the corresponding Wintu forms, on the basis of Gatschet's (1890:546 ff.) recording of the corresponding Modoc forms as *p'na*, *p'nalam*, etc. The Klamath /m/ thus obviously represents assimilation of this stop to the following /n/.

We should not overlook as an initial similarity the existence in both languages of a set of non-contrastive independent pronouns, which is by no means universal among North American languages. We can further identify as common to the two systems the following: a set of pronominal roots {ni} '1st', {mi} '2nd', {pi} '3rd'; a contrastive suffix {o}, reflected in the Klamath 1st person contrastive /no:/, and probably in the 3rd object form /bo:s/, by analogy with the 1st obj. contrastive form /no:s/; an object marker {-s}, and parallel paired plural stems, one in -l and one in -t.

It is sometimes suggested that in view of the ubiquity of 1st and 2nd pronominal roots in, respectively, *n* and *m* in North American languages, this resemblance cannot be taken as indicative of particularly close relationship between North American languages manifesting it. In this vein it has been suggested to me that the similarity of the 3rd person roots is stronger evidence of relationship than that of the 1st and 2nd person roots. But, of course, such evidence is compelling only in context; similarities between the third person roots would

carry little weight if the 1st and 2nd person roots were radically different. The coincidence of the three taken together, however, must be taken seriously, especially in the context of the rest of the paradigms.

Given that the two languages both have non-contrastive pronominal forms which are not bound into the verb, the fact that both have contrastive formations is not surprising; but the fact that both appear to have the same contrastive morpheme is noteworthy. The distribution of the {o} element in the two paradigms is not absolutely identical. Note that in Klamath the 3rd singular {bi} form is contrastive; the noncontrastive 3rd singular function is carried by the demonstratives. Moreover, Barker's data contain no 2nd person contrastive form.⁵ It is striking, however, that in both languages we not only find the {o} element, but also find it restricted to singular forms.

The next shared feature is the objective suffix {s}. The resemblance of the objective forms is of particular interest because, while {s} is the regular object suffix in Klamath, it does not occur in Wintu outside of the pronominal paradigm. (The regular Wintu object suffix is {um}, the resemblance of which to the Klamath and Sahaptian genitive markers deserves further investigation; kin terms and 3rd person pronouns take a |-t| object suffix).⁶

The most significant, because the most inexplicable, resemblance between the paradigms is the parallelism of the two plural stems, one in -l and one in -t. In Wintu this alternation occurs only in the 1st and 2nd plural forms; in Klamath the actual alternation is likewise restricted to 1st and 2nd person, although it appears possible that in the 3rd person plural forms the subject (contrastive) form may be constructed on the -t stem, and the oblique forms on the -l stem. (Gatschet lists only -l stem oblique forms for 1st and 2nd person, but for 3rd person plural object lists, along with *p'nals* or *p'nalas*, a form *pa:ntch*, presumably his recording of /pa:nds/, which could be the corresponding -t stem. He also lists a form *p'na:s*, which lacks either plural formative). With the possible exception of the Klamath 3rd person forms, the alternation has no apparent synchronic significance in either language. Note that in Klamath only the -t stem occurs in subject forms, and only the -l stem in genitives; with the object suffix the two stems are in free variation.⁶ In Wintu likewise only the -l stem occurs in genitive forms; in the paradigms given by Pitkin there is no separate objective form for the plural pronominals.

We must also take note of several other differences among the paradigms. To begin with, I have omitted from the Wintu paradigm a dual series and a set of reflexives with no parallel in Klamath, as well as an inclusive form and an instrumental series which, unlike the object forms, are formed regularly by the addition of the normal instrumental suffix to the oblique stem. From the transparent regularity of the dual, reflexive,

and instrumental series in Wintu we can infer that they are recent developments within Wintuan, rather than old elements lost in Klamath.

Included in the data given here are several Klamath forms which do not match with anything in Wintu:⁷ the 2nd sg. and pl. subject {?i} and {?a:d}, 3rd pl. subject {sa}, and 1st sg. possessive {gew}. These do not seem likely to admit of any comparative interpretation, but they are also precisely the forms which do not fit regularly within their own paradigm.⁸

II. Special locative constructions

Klamath has a set of 28 morphemes of generally locational or directional sense, which are distinguished as a class by their occurrence with a set of locative suffixes which do not occur with members of other categories (Barker 1964:278-80, 285-7). The suffixes which occur with these "Locatives" are ({dal'} and {y'e:n'} occur with members of some other syntactic categories):

| | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--|
| {t} ÷ {t'a} | 'in, on, at' | |
| {t'i:t} | 'in, on, at' | (Barker analyzes this as {t} plus a morpheme {'i:t} occurring only with {t}) |
| {na} | 'around, in a general area' | |
| {dal'} | 'toward' | |
| {y'e:n'} | "nonnominative theme formant" | |

Wintu has a similarly defined set of eleven "uninflected words of directional meaning" , and a set of locative suffixes which occur only with these "directionals" and two other morphemes, /tu/ 'ahead' and /xun/ 'toward' which do not occur as free forms (Pitkin 1984:262-3). The suffixes are:

| | |
|-------|---------------------------|
| {ti} | 'at, in' |
| {da} | 'from, of' |
| {dal} | 'at, in the direction of' |
| {el} | 'toward, in' |

While there do not seem to be any obvious (or even plausible) resemblances between semantically corresponding members of the Klamath Locative and Wintu directional stem categories,⁹ there is an obvious parallel in the existence in each language of such a category, defined by its own unique locative morphology. The parallel gains interest when we note the similarities in the sets of special locative suffixes which define this category:

| <u>Klamath</u> | <u>Wintu</u> |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| {t}, {t'a}, {t'i:t} | {ti} 'at, in' |
| 'in, on, at' | |
| {dal'} | {dal} 'at, in the direction of' |
| 'toward' | {el} 'toward' |

These resemblances are certainly striking, but in themselves too few to count as very much evidence for anything. However, their evidentiary value is considerably increased by their morphosyntactic parallelism: if to the obvious phonological and semantic congruence we add the fact that in each language these morphemes constitute a special category of locative suffixes which occur only with a small set of locative/directional morphemes, the degree of arbitrary resemblance between the two sets begins to be more than should be casually attributed to chance. Note, moreover, that the restricted distribution of these morphemes in both languages is evidence of antiquity; they appear to be old locative constructions retained in a semi-frozen lexical subsystem, and replaced elsewhere by newer formations.

III. Some notes on the Klamath and Wintu verb

At first glance a suggestion of a genetic connection between Klamath and Wintu would seem to find no support whatever in the verb systems of the two languages. While they do share a number of non-universal syntactic and semantic categories, none seem so striking as to require any explanation beyond chance and shared areal features, and structurally the system described by Barker and that described by Pitkin seem on superficial inspection to have little in common beyond a taste for suffixation. However, through internal reconstruction and further analysis, the Klamath system can be simplified to a point where it is much more directly comparable to that of Wintu, and at that point similarities can be found between the exponents of some comparable categories in the two languages which may well repay further investigation.

Of the numerous suffixal position classes in Barker's analysis of the Klamath verb, several of those closest to the stem (Barker's classes 17-19 and 21) can be shown to be later developments of morphemes originating as locative "suffixes",¹⁰ and thus ignored for comparative purposes. Another class (Barker's 20) consists of morphemes whose phonological bulk and semantic specificity imply fairly recent incorporation into the verb. In order to compare the remaining elements of the verb complex, it is necessary to add one dimension to Barker's analysis, and distinguish subsystems of suffixes, rather than simply position classes. Thus, for example, Barker places in a single class (22) the morphemes {astg} 'tried but failed to', {ang} 'polite imperative singular', and {w} 'past nominalizer', and in the next class (23) {a} 'indicative', {i} 'sg. imperative', {at} 'pl. imperative', and {y} 'noun formant'. This presentation obscures the fact that {astg} cannot be followed by {i} or {at}, {ang} can be followed only by {at} or nothing, while {w} can only, and must, be followed by {y}.

While I do not yet have a complete reanalysis of the Klamath verb to present, it seems at present that Barker's classes 22-25 can be reorganized into a system roughly like the following:¹¹

| | | |
|---------------------|----------|-----|
| INDICATIVE SYSTEM: | astg} | a |
| | Wi: | at |
| IMPERATIVE SYSTEM: | | i |
| | (ang ()) | at) |
| | | ek |
| | | n'a |
| SUBORDINATE SYSTEM: | | ank |
| | | tko |
| | (dgi) | wk |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---|---|---|
| NOMINALIZATION SYSTEM: | k' | y | s | t |
| | w | | | i |

A Tentative Reconstruction of the Klamath Verb

The nominalization system will be discussed below; rough glosses for the other morphemes are: {astg} 'tried but failed to', {Wi:} 'almost, used to', {a} 'indicative', {at} 'can, ought to', {ang} 'polite imperative', {i} 'sg. imperative', {at} 'pl. imperative', {ek} '1st sg. hortative', {n'a} '1st pl. hortative', {ank} 'temporal anteriority', {dk(o)} '(resulting) state', {dgi} (usually + {wk} or {gi} 'be' + {wk}) 'complement to verbs of persuasion or coercion', {wk} 'cause, purpose, or goal'.

All Wintu verb forms are based on one of three stems, which Pitkin calls Indicative, Imperative, and Nominal. The Indicative stem formant, in form and allomorphy, is reminiscent of the Klamath indicative suffix {a}. The Imperative formation is not obviously similar to the Klamath imperative system; there are, however, reasons to think that some or all of the Klamath imperative suffixes may be relatively recent developments. Of particular interest here is the Wintu Nominal stem. It is formed by a morpheme whose basic shape is {i}, which ordinarily must be followed by one of the two "nominal aspect" morphemes {s} or {t}. Compare the Wintu and Klamath nominal systems, recalling that just as Klamath {y} must be followed by {s}, which may then optionally be followed by {t} or {i}, so Wintu {i} must be followed by either {s} or {t}:

| | | |
|----------|----|---|
| Wintu: | | t |
| | i | |
| | | s |
| Klamath: | k' | t |
| | y | s |
| | w | i |

This minor formal similarity is, in itself, not compelling, although if we were sure on other grounds (such as the similarity of the pronominal paradigms, for example) that the languages were related, it would seem likely *prima facie* that the corresponding

parts of these paradigms are cognate. Obviously this argument will be strengthened if the functions of the corresponding *i/y*, *s*, and *t* morphemes are found to be somehow relatable.

Some functional parallels can be adduced which bolster the case somewhat, although the argument cannot be pursued very far without a more thorough understanding of both Klamath and Wintu syntax than I possess. Wintu {i} and Klamath {y} are roughly parallel in having no particular function beyond creating a nominal stem. Wintu {s} and {t} are the exponents of the famous system of "nominal aspect" described by Lee (1942, 1944). Without going into the intricacies of the system described by Lee and the reanalyzed system described by Pitkin, we may note simply that the formation reflected in the |s| allomorph of Pitkin's generic morpheme {s} appears historically to be a simple nominalizer (cf. Pitkin 1984, Whistler 1980:256), and thus parallel to Klamath {s}. The {t} 'particular aspect' category and its Klamath parallels participate in both the noun and verb systems, and thus deserve a separate section.

IV. The definite {t} suffixes

The |t| which participates in the Klamath nominalization system is analyzed by Barker as the same morpheme as a {t} which he glosses 'referential', which occurs also with various other nominals. In most of its uses it indicates "something previously referred to" (Barker 1964:173); in this function it occurs freely with demonstratives, and otherwise only with time expressions. This rather peculiar restriction suggests that the current distribution of the morpheme in Klamath may be a relic of an earlier more productive construction, although other hypotheses are possible.

With verb stems {t} occurs only with a preceding {s}, and the distinction between nominalizations in {-s} and in {-s-t} marks the distinction between complement clauses with subject the same as ({-s}) and different from ({-s-t}) that of the main clause. Thus we find {-s-t} in examples like:

domna ?a-n honks swi:-s-t
hear DEC-1st DEM/OBJ singing
'I hear him singing.'

The {t} morpheme in Wintu marks the "particular" aspect of nominals. I will not attempt to summarize here the discussions by Lee and Pitkin of the semantics and morphology of this category, beyond noting that it is associated with, among other things, referentiality and definiteness,¹² and that |t| is one of two exponents of the category, the other being |h|. The |t| allomorph¹³ occurs regularly with pronominals and nominalized verbs, i.e. in a distribution reminiscent of Klamath 'referential' {t}.

Thus in form, distribution, and at least rough function, the Klamath 'referential' and the Wintu 'particular' {t} show considerable similarity. Again, it seems that, while the resemblances are not sufficient to themselves make a case for relationship, they are of a nature that in the context of other evidence for relationship makes them worth pursuing further.

Notes

1) Work reported in this paper was supported in part by Grant # RO-21292-86 from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

2) This is not, of course, to say that there is no use in searching further afield. It is clear at this point that there is a genetic relationship between Klamath and Sahaptian, from which it follows that if it is worthwhile to look for Klamath-California connections, it is worthwhile to look for Sahaptian-California connections. In the case of other putatively Penutian languages, so little comparative work has been done (though recently see Buckley 1988) that there is no substantive basis for predicting what the outcome of such work would be.

3) This locution should not be taken to imply that there is any reason at this point to think that the relationship between Klamath and Wintu is particularly close within Penutian.

4) The data in this section will be published separately in IJAL.

5) The Klamath data suggest that the contrastive is no longer a transparent regular formation in the language. This probably correlates with the fact that the non-contrastive forms have a strong tendency to cliticize, normally in sentence-second position. The language as recorded thus seems to be tending toward a Sahaptin-like pronominal system, with second position clitic non-contrastive pronouns, and only contrastive independent pronouns. (There is no apparent difference in the systems recorded by Barker and by Gatschet, so it is probably not the case that the decay of the contrastive formation represents a late phenomenon associated with the moribund state of the language when Barker recorded it).

6) Howard Berman and Victor Golla, in personal communications, have both pointed out an -s/-se object suffix in Costanoan. Note however that there is some evidence for an old vocalic object marker in some California languages (Berman 1983:402). This latter may be reflected in the Klamath {a} object suffix used with adjectives and kin terms (Barker 1964:235, 266), which seems to be a conservative retention of an older pattern, and which may be equatable with the Sahaptian subject suffix {a} which occurs only with kin terms.

7) Barker 1964:240: "No semantic distinction is found between |na:ds| and |na:l's|, but the latter is more frequent"; the same is true for the 2nd and 3rd person alternations.

8) I have omitted only non-matching categories, such as the Wintu inclusive; where the two languages share a category but show non-comparable forms the forms are nevertheless given. I have not included in the discussion the Klamath reduced clitic forms; most of these are transparently relatable to the fuller Klamath forms discussed here.

9) Victor Golla (p.c.) notes a few forms from Yokuts, Takelma, and Chinookan which suggest that the Klamath {ni} / {gew} alternation may be an old inheritance; this would imply that the Wintu 1st genitive form might be a later analogical regularization. Gatschet (1890:547) suggests that 2nd person {?i} and {?a:d} were innovated to avoid homophony between the singular *mi and the 2nd sg. genitive, and between the plural *ma:t and an evidential particle {mat} which, like the pronouns, tends to occur in 2nd position. There may be an element of truth in this, but it is at least oversimple; note that this account requires, to begin with, an explanation for how 2nd person *mi, presumably originally subjective, acquired its genitive function.

10) For example, while the names of the cardinal directions belong to the relevant category in both languages, there are no apparent resemblances in the forms. However, it is worth noting that some at least of the Klamath directional terms appear to be of no great antiquity: /lobi:t-dal'/ 'east, toward the east' is literally 'toward the front' (Barker 1963:220), referring to the orientation of a house.

11) Klamath has a bipartite stem construction very similar to that described by Jacobsen (1980) for Washo, with over a hundred primarily locative or motional "suffixes"; it is these that are the source for a significant part of the modern verb morphology. This system, which is not shared with Wintu, may be a trans-montane areal phenomenon, as very similar systems are found in Sahaptian and Atsugewi, while similarly elaborated systems are lacking in Wintu and Pomo, and in general appear not to be found west of the mountains.

12) Barker also includes in class 23 the future suffix {wabg}, but in Gatschet's data this occurs regularly followed by the indicative {a}, and must thus be relegated to an earlier position class. I am hopeful that further analysis of Gatschet's data will make it possible to assign {wabg} to its historically proper position.

White (1983:5) notes that of the non-nominalizing members of category 23, only {wabg} can occur non-finally, that is, followed by members of classes 24 and 25. Thus elimination of {wabg} from class 23 obviates the need for separate classes 24 and 25 outside of the nominalization system.

13) While noting that the synchronic function of the particular aspect cannot be described simply as an analogue to definiteness in western European languages, Pitkin suggests that the {t} suffix may have developed from "a topic-alizing/foregrounding suffix *{t} with something like the force of a definite article" (1984:203). (Cp. the similar hypothesis of Whistler (1980)

14) |t| and |h| are treated, explicitly by Pitkin and implicitly by others, as allomorphs of a single particular aspect morpheme {t}. While this is certainly the appropriate synchronic analysis, it seems clear that the two morphs have different

REFERENCES

Barker, M.A.R. 1963. Klamath Dictionary, UCPL 31. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Barker, M.A.R. 1964. Klamath Grammar, UCPL 32. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Berman, Howard. 1983. Some California Penutian morphological elements. IJAL 49:400-12.

Buckley, Eugene. 1988. Coast Oregon Penutian: A lexical comparison. Proceedings of the Third Pacific Linguistics Conference. Eugene, OR: Dept. of Linguistics, University of Oregon.

Gatschet, Albert S. 1890. The Klamath Indians of Southwestern Oregon, Part I. Contributions to North American Ethnology, vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Jacobsen, William. 1980. Washo bipartite stems. K. Klar, M. Langdon, and S. Silver, eds., American Indian and Indoeuropean Studies: Papers in Honor of Madison S. Beeler, pp. 85-99. New York: Mouton.

Lee, Dorothy Demetracopoulou. 1942. Noun categories in Wintu. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 6.197-210.

Lee, Dorothy Demetracopoulou. 1944. Categories of the generic and particular in Wintu:. AA, n.s. 46:362-9.

Pitkin, Harvey. 1984. Wintu Grammar, UCPL 94. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Whistler, Kenneth. 1980. Proto-Wintun Kin Classification: A Case Study in Reconstruction of a Complex Semantic System. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

White, Robin. 1973. Klamath Phonology. Studies in Linguistics and Language Learning 12. Seattle: Dept. of Linguistics, University of Washington.

Permission to scan and mount granted by the author on 7/1/02.
Comments to the author can be sent to:
View Professor Scott DeLancey's Linguistics Homepage at
www.uoregon.edu/~delancey/prohp.html